

said \$1 billion in trade surplus or trade deficit translates into 13,000 jobs. He said that 15 years ago. No President has quantified that since. But think about that. Thousands of jobs for every \$1 billion in trade deficit or surplus. Well, with China alone, we have three-quarters of \$1 billion every single day. Our trade deficit with the whole world is \$600 billion, more than that.

So we buy \$600 billion more than we sell to the world every year. How can a country, no matter how wealthy—and this is a rich country still, even though millions of people have been unemployed, have lost manufacturing jobs in my State and other States across the country. How can we continue as a prosperous nation if manufacturing is outsourced and these jobs go somewhere else?

I don't believe ever that I can think of in world history—and I have said this before and nobody has challenged it—have we seen a business plan of American companies moving to China, manufacturing there, and then selling back to the United States. A company such as Proctor & Gamble, on the other hand, they moved production to China, but they sell from their Chinese operations to China, East Asia, probably Taiwan and maybe Japan and Malaysia. They have their production in the areas they sell to. That makes perfect sense. That is good for those countries, good for those workers, good for the United States, and good for Cincinnati where Proctor & Gamble is located. But these companies that have it as their business plan to shut down production here, move to China, and then sell those products that they make in Shanghai and Wuhan and Beijing instead of in Akron, Canton, and Toledo—sell those products back to consumers in Oregon, Ohio, and Maine—that is why this legislation is so important.

A new study said we have lost 2.8 million jobs in the last decade to China because of currency manipulation; 1.9 million of those jobs are in manufacturing. You know what has happened in places such as Portland, and the Senator from Maine knows what has happened in her Portland, and what that has meant to lost jobs in this country. And understanding the reason that happens is because China games the system, because China doesn't play fair—pure and simple, say it straight, because China cheats. They have been given, for all intents and purposes, a 25 or 30 percent subsidy to their products. So because they cheat on currency—putting aside how they subsidize their paper industry, for instance, with water and capital and energy and land. Just on currency alone, when they sell something into the United States, they have a 25 to 30 percent cost advantage. I know companies in places around my State, in Mansfield, Springfield, Zanesville, Chillicothe, will say that the cost of raw materials is higher than the cost of the product when it comes from China. Why? Because China cheats.

And one of the ways they cheat is they undervalue their currency so they have a 25-percent discount on their products sold into the United States. We can't compete with that, no matter that our workers are efficient, no matter that our companies are efficient, no matter that we cut costs in so many ways with the more advanced technologies and advanced manufacturing that we do.

So that is why this was such an important step, passing overwhelmingly and sending to the floor for debate today—79-19—this bipartisan jobs bill called the Currency Exchange Rate Oversight and Reform Act of 2011.

Earlier today I was in Cleveland and I had a meeting with two owners of a company in Brunswick, OH, more or less a Cleveland suburb, Automation Tool & Dye. It is a family company that has been in operation since 1974. The owners, the two sons, Randy and Bill Bennett, spoke today about their company. They have, I believe they said, 55 employees who are a major part of American manufacturing. They are the kind of company that when it is such a disadvantage on currency, it puts them in a less than competitive position sometimes. They are still doing OK, but they know how hard the business climate is when they are at that disadvantage.

So when they are making products, because China has gamed the system and an American company might move to China to do production, they can't up and move their family company of 55 employees—they can't move to China to service the company that has moved to China because of the competitive disadvantage.

So we know how that has worked. We know why this legislation that Senator SNOWE has worked on, the two bills we put together, Senator SNOWE and my bill with Senators SCHUMER and GRAHAM. As I said, we have had good strong bipartisan sponsorship on this bipartisan jobs bill and we have also had a very good vote today that was 79-19 to move this forward.

The Economic Policy Institute issued a new report showing that addressing Chinese currency manipulation could support the creation of 2.25 million American jobs, mostly in manufacturing, mostly the kind of jobs that will create other jobs because of the wealth that Senator SNOWE talked about, the wealth that manufacturing creates. And as Senator SNOWE pointed out, when the opponents to this—and too often we have seen administrations of both parties oppose bills such as this. When opponents say this is protectionism, I don't know what is wrong with protecting our families and protecting our country. But ceding that, they say this is protectionism. This, in fact, is a reaction to Chinese protectionism. And the People's Republic of China has not really believed in the rule of law when it comes to trade. There is an emphatic strong insistence by the U.S. Senate that we do believe in the rule of law for

international trade; that we do think all actors should behave. We do think that everybody in the trading system should work on a level playing field.

Today was the biggest step I have seen the U.S. Senate take since I came here in 2007. We are going to have a long debate this week. Everybody is going to get their chance. Some Members of the Senate who wanted us to debate this are still not quite sure exactly where we go with this. I think it is pretty clear, though, that the U.S. Senate today reflects what the people of this great country believe: That we make things.

My State is the third largest manufacturing State in America. Only Texas and California, States that are twice and three times our size in population, make more than we do. We know how to produce. We need to continue to produce. We know that manufacturing creates wealth.

This is a huge victory—only a first step but a huge first step and a victory for American manufacturing to help us reindustrialize our country.

I thank my colleagues for this 79-19 vote. I thank Senator SNOWE especially for her terrific work on both sides of the aisle in getting this bill moving forward. It is going to matter for workers in Toledo, Dayton, Cleveland, and Columbus. And for that, I am grateful.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BURMA SANCTIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to note final passage last week of the Burmese Freedom and Democracy Act, which extends sanctions on the Burmese regime for another year. As in years past, I am joined in this effort by my good friend, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN. Alongside the two of us are 64 other cosponsors, including Senators MCCAIN, DURBIN, and LIEBERMAN. This overwhelming bipartisan support for sanctioning the junta reflects the clear view of the U.S. Senate that the purportedly "new" Burmese regime that took office earlier this year so far appears little different from the "old" regime.

The casual observer could be excused for thinking that things have changed

dramatically for the better in Burma over the past year. After all, elections were held last fall, a “new” regime took office earlier this year, and Aung San Suu Kyi was freed. However, as our experience with Burma has taught us, things there usually require a closer look.

First, the November elections took place without the benefit of international election monitors, and no reputable observers viewed the elections as free or fair. This was in large part because the National League for Democracy—Suu Kyi’s party and the winner overwhelmingly of the last free elections in the country in 1990—was effectively banned by the junta and couldn’t participate in the election. There were restrictions placed on how other political parties could form and campaign. No criticism of the junta was permitted. And the results were unsurprising: the regime’s handpicked candidates won big and the democratic opposition was largely sidelined.

Second, the “new” regime appears to be essentially the junta with only the thinnest democratic veneer. The Constitution, which places great power in the hands of the military, cannot be amended without the blessing of the armed forces. Furthermore, those in parliament are limited in how they can criticize the regime.

The only legitimately good news was Suu Kyi’s release. Yet the extent of her freedom to travel remains an open question. Moreover, despite her release, nearly 2,000 other political prisoners remain behind bars in Burma; they are no better off than before. Neither are the hundreds of thousands of refugees and displaced persons who are without a home due to the repressive policies of the junta.

That the political situation in Burma remains largely unchanged is also reflected in the defection this summer of two Burmese diplomats. One of them was the Burmese Deputy Chief of Mission here in Washington. He wrote a letter to the Secretary of State requesting political asylum and, according to press reports, in the letter, he stated as follows:

My efforts to improve bilateral ties have been continually rejected and resulted in my being deemed dangerous by the government. Because of this, I am also convinced and live in fear that I will be prosecuted for my actions, efforts, and beliefs when I return to Naypyidaw after completing my tour of duty here. The truth is that senior military officials are consolidating their grip on power and seeking to stamp out the voices of those seeking democracy, human rights, and individual liberties.

These words do not come from a Western government or an NGO; they come from a senior Burmese diplomat. His words make clear that the democratic trappings of the “new” regime are in many ways just a façade.

Finally, it is worth noting that there remain important security considerations that must be addressed before ending sanctions. The junta’s increasingly close bilateral military relation-

ship with North Korea, in particular, is a source of much concern.

I am hopeful that the time will soon come when sanctions against the Burmese government will no longer be needed; that like South Africa in the early 1990s, the people of Burma will be able to free themselves from their own government. However, as evidenced in the Deputy Chief of Mission’s letter, the Burmese junta appears to maintain an iron grip on its people, and continues to carry out a foreign policy that is inimical to U.S. interests. The United States must continue to deny this regime the legitimacy it craves by continuing sanctions, and these sanctions must remain in place until true democratic reform comes to the people of Burma.

HUNGER ACTION MONTH

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, this past month we recognized Hunger Action Month, a time for all Americans to focus on the problem of hunger in our communities. As we begin the month of October, we must remember that this is a year-round reality for many individuals and families around the country and that our efforts to eradicate this problem must continue.

Our Nation continues to face both a 9.1-percent unemployment rate, as well as a 15.1-percent poverty rate. Everyone has been touched in some way by this challenging economy. Many of our friends, neighbors and family members still might be struggling in ways that they never imagined with less money to spend and tough choices to make. Thankfully, there have been a number of community assistance organizations that have been able to step up and help out.

Many of these are local food banks and soup kitchens that are challenged to find resourceful ways to do more with less in order to provide services to those in need in their communities. One such organization that is still making a significant difference is the Arlington Food Assistance Center, AFAC. For over 20 years the AFAC has partnered with local churches, schools and social service agencies to assist over 1,200 families weekly with their basic food needs. Last year the AFAC was able to distribute over 2.3 million pounds of food directly to Arlington community residents. Community support of AFAC and thousands of organizations like it across the country is integral to their ability to provide the necessary services to those most in need. We must continue to give our support.

I hope my colleagues will join me in recognizing the Arlington Food Assistance Center and the many other organizations like it, as well as the importance of our commitment to addressing the problem of hunger across the Nation.

CUBA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article highlighting the Castro regime’s continued abuse of the Cuban people as they organize efforts to create a freer Cuba. The people being held unjustly and abused in Cuban prisons—as well as those being intimidated and repressed outside of prison—need the continued support of America.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 2011]

AMERICA’S: CUBA’S REPRESSION ESCALATES

(By Mary Anastasia O’Grady)

Former New Mexico Gov. Bill Richardson returned home from an attempted hostage-rescue mission to Cuba last month empty-handed and “still scratching [his] head” as to why the Castro regime double-crossed him. What is truly baffling is why Mr. Richardson expected anything different from a dictatorship operating in extreme-repression mode.

In a Sept. 14 interview with CNN’s Wolf Blitzer, Mr. Richardson said he had been invited to the island to discuss the release of U.S. Agency for International Development contractor Alan Gross. Mr. Gross was arrested in December 2009 and is serving a 15-year sentence.

Mr. Richardson admitted that he got stiffed by Cuba’s “foreign ministry, which a lot of the people there I know and have been friends” with. What he could not grasp is why those “friends”—a strange designation for individuals who might one day be hauled before an international human-rights tribunal—don’t appreciate the Obama administration’s outreach. Yes, they are “hardliners,” he admitted, but they ought to understand that the White House has been bending over backward to get along.

Actually they do understand, and that’s why they treated him so badly.

Mr. Richardson told Mr. Blitzer that he was “flabbergasted” when, after a “delightful” three-hour lunch discussing how U.S.-Cuba relations might be improved—including, he told me by phone Friday, the possibility of removing the country from the list of state sponsors of terrorism after the release of Mr. Gross—the foreign minister “slammed me three ways: one, no seeing Alan Gross; no getting him out; and no seeing Raul Castro.”

What happened was very predictable. The “loosened travel restrictions” and increased “remittances [from] Cuban-Americans” that Mr. Richardson cited as signs of Mr. Obama’s willingness to deal are read as weakness by the bullying regime. It has something, i.e., somebody, the U.S. wants back very badly, and the administration acts as if it is powerless. Why should Castro deal?

Mr. Richardson did even less for Cuba’s dissidents. One Richardson pearl of wisdom, shared on CNN, was that Cuba’s “human-rights situation has improved.” In fact, human rights in Cuba are rapidly deteriorating. To claim otherwise is to abandon the island’s brave democrats when they most need international solidarity.

Ask Sonia Garro, pictured in the nearby photo (See accompanying photo—WSJ October 3, 2011) . . . For years Ms. Garro has denounced the regime’s discrimination against Afro-Cubans. Despite her own poverty, in 2007 she created a recreation center in her home for poor, unsupervised children, according to a report by an independent Cuban